

Appl. No. 09/981,476
Amdt. Dated July 25, 2005
Reply to Office Action of 5/24/05

Docket No. IND10254
Customer No. 22917

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3-6 and 13. No new matter was added by these amendments. Claims 1 and 3-13 remain in this application. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks and arguments.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steeves (USPN 6,570,487) in view of Meier (USPN 5,294,931). Applicants traverse these rejections because the combined teachings of Steeves and Meier fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended Claims 1 and 6 and in dependent Claims 3-5 and 7-13.

More specifically, Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitations of "ceasing transmitting data if the second predetermined condition is satisfied, wherein ...the second predetermined condition is satisfied based on the received power level" and have amended Claim 6 to include the limitations of the transmitter "is further configured to cease transmitting the data when a second condition is satisfied, wherein ...the second condition is satisfied based on the received power level." Thus, in the present application, the tag by itself does not determine when to cease data transmission. The reader dynamically (asynchronously) controls when a group of activated tags cease data transmissions through the control of the reader transmitted carrier power level.

This is in contrast to the Steeves and Meier methods, which do not possess continuous reader carrier transmission that dynamically (asynchronously) alters tag transmission stopping conditions. In both Steeves and Meier, transmission ceases only upon the complete transmission of the data. In Steeves, "after all of the packets have been successfully transmitted, processing returns to 306 and the tag is put back in the quiescent low-power stand-by state." Col. 9, lines 35-37. In Meier, "at the end of the information signal the control logic system 50 [of the tag] will ...discharge the capacitor 44." Col. 7, lines 20-23.

Appl. No. 09/981,476
Amdt. Dated July 28, 2005
Reply to Office Action of 5/24/05

Docket No. IND10254
Customer No. 22917

For all of these reasons, Applicants believe that amended Claims 1 and 6 are now in a condition for allowance and that Claims 2-5 and 7-13, which respectfully depend from and include all of the limitations of Claims 1 and 6, are likewise in a condition for allowance.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Valerie M. Davis
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: 847-576-6733
Fax No.: 847-576-0721